RECEIVED FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

Baker Hostetler

October 4, 2010

2010 OCT -5 AM 10: 20

OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL

Baker&Hostetler up

Washington Square, Suite 1109 1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20038-5304

T 202.861.1500 F 202.861.1783 www.bakerlaw.com

E. Mark Braden direct dial: 202.861.1504 MBraden@bakerlaw.com

Federal Election Commission General Counsel Office

999 E Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20463 Attention Frankie D. Hampton

Re RIUR 6366

Dear Ms. Hampton:

This letter is in response to the Federal Election Commission's ("Commission") letters to Charles and Judy Black, notifying them that the Commission had received a complaint that indicates they may have violated the Federal Election Campaign Act ("Act") of 1971, as amended. A copy of the complaint was enclosed with the Commission's letter.

I have been retained to represent Charles and Judy Black. After a review of the complaint, it is clear this matter as regard the Blacks should be immediately terminated without further action by the Commission. The Act and the Commission's regulations require that a complaint meets certain requirements. The complaint filed by Ryan Miscall fails to meet these requirements. The Commission has no authority to move forward with an investigation on any matter based upon a complaint which fails to meet the basic requirements of its regulations.

The complaint does comply with two requirements of the Commission's regulations:

- (1) It provides the full name and address of the complainant; and
- (2) It is sworn to and signed in the presence of a notary public and is notarized.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(1); 11 C.F.R. § 111.4

<sup>11</sup> C.F.R. § 111.4(b)(1) and (2).
Chicago Cincinnati Cleveland Columbus Costa Mesa
Denver Houston Los Angeles New York Orlando Washington, DC

The complaint fails to comply with other requirements. A complaint must, if not based upon personal knowledge, be accompanied by an identification of the source of information which gives rise to a complaint's batisf of the truth of such statement. None of the statements in the complaint that relate to Charles or Judy Black are based upon the complainant's personal knowledge. If appears Ryan Miskell has no personal knowledge of any relevant facts about the Blacks in regard to this matter. The complaint does not identify any specific source for the information he uses for his assertions.

The deficiency is evidenced in even a cursory review of the complaint. The first reference to my clients appears under the heading "FACTS" in Paragraph 8 which states: it is britievad through pulitic information and knowledgeatus spurces that Josti Penry and Bill Miller coordinated with Cherlie and Judy Black to raise money for the independent expenditure." Who are the knowledgeable sources? Where is the public information? The complaint has no identification of the source of this alleged public information or knowledgeable sources. None of the attached documents refers to any fundraising, communication or campaign activities of either Charles or Judy Black with the Chamber. In fact, there is not a single reference to Charles or Judy Black in any of the "supporting documentations."

One statement in the complaint is securate - Judy Blank dises work at Brownstein Hyatt Father Schrank ("Firm"). The Firm does lobby for an affiliated or subsidiary organization of the U.S. Chamber - the Institute for Legal Reform ("Institute"). Judy Black does not labby for this client and was unaware of the Firm's representation prior to receiving the complaint. The Firm's representation of this Institute is of no relevance to the Commission's analysis of the complaint. The Firm's lobbying representation for legal reform has no relationship to the Norton Campaign or any of the Chamber's expenditures in a Colorado primary election.

Attached to this researches are afficients of Charles and Judy Black, empressly denying they raised money for my Charles of Commerce independent exceptitums or electionscring communications. They stated unequivocally that they have no knowledge of any meeting between the Norton campaign or the Chamber to coordinate any independent expenditures or electionsering communications.

There is no public information provided to the Commission with the complaint. There are no names of knowledgeable sources provided to the Commission. Why are none provided in the complaint when the Commission's rules expressly require them? Because these is no public imformation ner knowledgeable sources to support these groundless assertions. Without any factual basis, the simple assertions of violations of the Act by the complainant are insufficient under the Commission's regulations for this matter to make forward.

Since the Blacks raised no money for the Chamber, had no role in the creation or placement of any independent expenditure or electioneering communication by the Chamber, and were not aware of any communication between the Chamber, its agents,

<sup>3 11</sup> C.F.R. § 111.4(d)(2).

Federal Election Commission General Counsel Office Page 3

the Norton primary campaign or its agents regarding any independent expenditure or electioneering communication, this matter whould be closed immediately by the Commission with regards to my clients.

Sincerely,

The Sandar

E. Mark Braden

**Enclosures** 

103550585

## STATEMENT OF DESIGNATION OF COUNSEL

MUR: 6366

NAME OF COUNSEL: E. Mark Braden

FIRM:

Baker & Hostetler, Counselors at Law

Washington Square, Suite 1100 1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036-5304

TELEPHONE:

(202) 861-1504

FAX:

(202) 861-1783

The above-named individual is hereby designated as my counsel and is authorized to receive any notifications and other communications from the Commission and to act on my behalf before the Commission.

9-12-10

Date

Signature

RESPONDENT' NAME:

Charles R. Black

ADDRESS:

1110 Vermont Avenue, N.W.

Suite 1000

Washington, D€ 20005

PHONE:

HOME:

BUSINESS

(202) 530-0500